● **CHARTER** ● **MEMBERS** ● **WORKSHOPS** ● **RELATED LINKS** ●
● **WHAT'S NEW** ●

Hanford Openness Workshop
Workshop 3 Summary
February 4, 1998

Introduction and Meeting Business

- Welcome

Openness Advisory Panel presentation

Tom Cotton gave a presentation on the Openness Advisory Panel (OAP) which reports to the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board (SEAB). The OAP was formed to evaluate DOE's classification policy, to advise SEAB on the status and strategic direction of openness, to advocate improvements and to provide public input. The OAP will convene its first field meeting on Friday, February 13, 1998 in Richland, WA. Tom Cotton saw a real value in the OAP and the Hanford Openness Workshops working together in the future. The following points were highlighted:

- The ingredients of openness are: an improvement in declassification of documents, public access, and a change in the culture of secrecy.
- Improving declassification means narrowing the scope of classified information, while recognizing that some information must remain classified over time
- Development and dissemination of information finding aids and the improvement of records management are equally important. Poor records management in the long run keeps more information out of public hands than classification.
- Improved information management leads to improved DOE performance.
- Openness presents a difficulty to management—there is no line-item for openness and budget constraints tend to push it down the list of managerial priorities. Openness must be a core value.

Action Item: Michael Kern suggested that a letter be sent from the participants suggesting names of possible public candidates on the OAP.

Action Item: Max Power will represent the Hanford Openness Workshops (HOW) at the OAP meeting in Richland on 2/13/98.

Declassification Productivity Initiative presentation

Tom Curtis gave a presentation on the Declassification Productivity Initiative (DPI). Some

of the issues being encountered are:

- A computer system is under development that can look at text and then use the classification guides to detect sensitive information.
- DOE has very poor quality documents because the technology was different 40-50 years ago. Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology was developed for modern, word-processed documents, not typewritten, mimeographed, and carbon-copied documents.
- When it comes to accuracy of scanned documents, researchers are working on quantifying, "How good is good enough?" There are no preset, acceptable failure rate, but OCR accuracy impacts what you can do with the text.
- Every word has a legitimate use. A successful system needs to look at context, not just key-words.

SPIRE Presentation

Gus Calapristi made a presentation on SPIRE:

- an information visualization and analysis system which translates textual information into a 3-D metaphor, and;
- extracts and organizes documents into "clusters" based on key topics and then projects into a 2-D space as a galaxy or themescape.

National Archives and Records Administration/Federal Records Center Presentation

Candace Lein-Hayes presented information on the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and the Federal Records Center (FRC). She made the following points about Hanford-related records:

- Federal agencies can transfer records to an FRC for storage. Eventually, temporary copies are destroyed, while permanent records are transferred to NARA.
- Currently, there are two cubic feet of boxes containing documents regarding labor relations in the 50's at Hanford held at NARA. These documents are open to the public.
- The Seattle FRC has 40,000 boxes of documents related to Hanford. The FRC has physical custody of the records, but legal custody remains with DOE-RL. This is the case with all federal agencies. The public needs agency permission for access to documents stored at FRCs.
- Every federal agency has a "record retention schedule." This schedule determinds the length of time records are held, and becomes mandatory, once approved. The bulk of federal records are temporary and so, will be destroyed eventually, according to retention schedule.
- Since 1991, there has been a freeze on the destruction of Hanford records. This confirmed an unofficial practice at the Seattle FRC, dating back to 1988.
- The FRC depends on those sending the documents to accurately identify the documents.
- The public can comment on federal agencies' retention schedules. They are printed in the Federal Register.
- Copies of documents are not sent to FRCs; only originals. Some documents located at Hanford actually belonged to Savannah River and so were transferred there. As these

were permanent records there were moved to NARA-Atlanta and are now open to the public.

City of Seattle Technical Issues presentation

David Keyes from the City of Seattle gave a presentation on how they are addressing using information technology to increase accessibility. He noted the following:

- Pay attention to what resources and applications your end users have. Can they download documents? Can they link to other sites? Do they have email, etc
- Work with users, and have some sensitivity to how different people perceive information.
- Update content on a consistent basis and explain how content is organized and indexed.
- Consider document stability. As more people are depending on the web for information it puts the burden on organizations to be libraries.

Working Groups—Next Steps

Information Technology Working Group

- The Hanford Openness Workshops web site is up (http://www.hanford.gov/boards/ openness/index.htm). If you have comments, please contact Yvonne Sherman.
- The Information Technology Working Group report will include technology recommendations. One in particular will be that databases need to be in an accessible format. Participants were encouraged to give comments on the draft report to Yvonne Sherman, or join the Working Group to help make recommendations.

Tribal Working Group

- The Tribal Working group has had difficulty including participants from other tribes, which may be due in part to recent budget cuts.
- Russell Jim reiterated his concern that he does not know of any experts reviewing documents with an eye to tribal cultural effects.
- Participants will consider a special working group for tribal concerns after the fourth workshop.
- The existing models are inadequate in regard to cultural diversity. Tim Takaro summed up the situation by noting that biomedical studies focus on 80 kilogram white males and this does not capture the breadth of humanity.
- Russell Jim asked that the concerns of the tribes be remembered when Max Power represents HOW at the OAP meeting on February 13.

Action Item: Russell Jim's comments and others made during the Workshops will be condensed into a draft statement regarding tribal openness priorities to be reviewed, and cluded in the final report.

Document Title Review Working Group

- The main question is: how do we go about getting information about a document from its title? Hanford Summit II had some recommendations.

- Mary Lou Blazek explained that the group is going to take a more broad-based view of their topic than originally envisioned. She asked for feedback on the value of the group's work.
- The group would also like to provide a explanation of where documents are located and how to get access to them. This explanation could fit into a fact sheet with information about archives versus records.
- Participants have encountered several examples within their own work (Tim Takaro, for example) that openness is not alive and well. These examples could be included in the report.

Historical Information Working Group

- Greg deBruler said that he would distribute the main points of the Historical Information Working Group by e-mail to invite further comment. Members who don't use e-mail will be faxed.
- Participants agreed that even if we can only say at the end of the fourth workshop that we need more workshops, this in itself has some value. But, even if we don't have all of the products, we need to have some concrete points.

Action Item: By mid-March, Greg deBruler will have a first draft together of the working group's report.

Workshop Business

Adopt summaries

- The current summary was accepted and it was decided that the next summary would follow a similar format, with the inclusion of a brief statement of action items and their context.

Action Item: Tiffany Potter-Chiles to add corrections to the Workshop 2 Summary.

Date/Location of the Fourth Openness Workshop

- May 18, 1998 in Richland, WA. Exact location to be determined.
- Ruth Yarrow will be unable to make any meetings in May and will attempt to send an alternate.

Future Structure of the Openness Workshops

- A letter will be sent to Secretary Peña asking for funding to continue this work.
- It was suggested that future meetings be structured similarly to the Site Technologies Coordination Group (STCG). However the group would then fall under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements. As the workshops have been a success, maybe we should continue with the current format.

Action Item: Gerry Pollet, Greg deBruler, Mary Lou Blazek, Tom Carpenter and Tom Wood to draft letter to Secretary Peña requesting funding to continue the Hanford Openness Workshops.

Draft of the Final Report

Greg deBruler suggested that the document break down into three parts :

1. A historical summary of how openness evolved and the commitments that have been made;
2. Why we need to continue our work , citing current examples of failure to meet those commitments (2006 plan, etc.);
3. Specific performance measures intended to institutionalize openness (manager evaluation, etc.)

Action Item:

1. Working groups have draft reports to CRESP by 3/23.
2. CRESP compiles packet of reports and mails out to participants by 3/30.
3. Participants have comments on draft reports back to CRESP by 4/17.
4. CRESP incorporates comments and returns reports to participants by 5/4.

Action Item: Greg deBruler will include Hanford Summit II and NRC reports on the importance of openness into his section of the final report. He asked that participants fax, mail, or e-mail any pieces of the puzzle to him.

Meeting Adjourned

Hanford Home Page | Openness | Workshop Summary Index

For questions or comments about this page, please send email to Yvonne_T_Sherman@rl.gov
URL: http://www.hanford.gov/boards/openness/summary/020498.htm
Last Updated: 10/31/2002 11:47:17